

REPLY OF
PRES. JOSEPH SMITH,
TO L. O. LITTLEFIELD,
IN REFUTATION OF THE DOCTRINE OF
PLURAL MARRIAGE.

LAMONI, IOWA:
PUBLISHED BY THE REORGANIZED CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST
OF LATTER DAY SAINTS.

1885.

REPLY OF
PRES. JOSEPH SMITH,

TO L. O. LITTLEFIELD.

MR. L. O. LITTLEFIELD,
Logan City, Utah:

Sir:—Your letter of April 27th, in the *Logan Journal*, affords me a surprise. You have been pleased to take the statement of one of the speakers at the late conference of the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints in the Temple at Kirtland, Ohio, and upon that have predicated a letter to me; taking it for granted that the expressions of that speaker "ventilated" the spirit of the body there assembled. Would it not have been more in harmony with proper dealing to have quoted my own language upon that occasion, if I was to be the one to whom your letter and its arguments were to be directed? Or what might have been as properly done, to have quoted the address of my colleague, Elder W. W. Blair, who spoke upon the same occasion, the opening of our session? Mr. Blair is to be found at Salt Lake City, where he is stationed, and can be questioned as to the spirit of that assembly.

It is true that in the spring of 1882, the body to which I belong held a session of conference at Independence, Missouri, which was quite well attended; and it is also true that the fact of "Mormons under the leadership of the son of the Mormon prophet, Joseph Smith, holding conference in the place whence the Saints were driven" in 1838, created a sensation in the news-

paper world, but it is not true, as assumed by you, that we as a body held out any "flattering inducements by making that place the grand center of interest," for none such were offered; nor were any statements made by us as a people in reference to that meeting not warranted by the facts. The same is true in regard to the meeting at Kirtland. That the latter meeting was invested with more than ordinary interest, both to well meaning and faithful Latter Day Saints, and the world outside around Kirtland, is decidedly true; nor is it a matter of reproach to me, nor a fact of which any of those assembled there can for a moment be ashamed, that we were met with cordiality by many, and respectful attention and curiosity by all.

Those who were present at the dedication of that Temple at Kirtland, Ohio, when it was offered to the worship of God by those who had builded it, in solemn and earnest prayer, and who were permitted to sit in the renovated pulpits from which the gospel of life as revealed to Joseph Smith a half century ago was again proclaimed, testified then, testify now, that the same hallowed Spirit pervaded the assembly last held in those sacred walls by these men and women of the Reorganized Church during the days from April 6th to 14th that was manifested at that dedication service. And men who heard the fathers teach the way of life in those walls in 1834-5, declared that the sons set forth the same teachings. And when you, Mr. Littlefield, who were not present in the Temple last April, presume to say that the "spirit of Temple building" is, or was the principle characteristic spirit manifested by the Church in these early days, the keeping of which marks the "Utah Mormons" as the Church of Christ, you make the mistake which the Reorganization has so long and so openly accused the body under President B. Young and John Taylor of having made.

You are pleased to state that my "blood relationship" to my father "would not be a bar" to my rising to "high distinction," providing that my principles were "consonant with the real faith and policy of my father." You state further, that my "declaration of principles is in positive opposition to those which are well known to have been the doctrines and principles preached and practiced by that great man; principles for which he lost his life at Carthage jail, June 27th, 1844."

You have in the foregoing statement asserted much more than you can possibly prove; for my declaration of principles is precisely that which my father, Joseph Smith, the Seer, gave to I. Daniel Rupp, of Pennsylvania, for his "History of Religious Denominations" in the United States; and to John Wentworth, of Chicago, Illinois, for his paper, the *Democrat*; and which you will find in the *Times and Seasons*, published in Nauvoo, Illinois, for March 1st, 1842, and signed by him. I send you an Epitome of our Faith, which you will find to agree with this referred to, with the exception to which I shall hereafter cite; and which doubtless forms the "Stone of offense" in my profession of belief.

No proof that Joseph Smith taught and practiced polygamy, (publicly or privately), of an "incontrovertible character" was ever presented to me; and from the nature of the subject and the facts connected with the introduction of the doctrine as a church tenet, it is doubtful if such proof exists.

Joseph Smith never placed himself in the "attitude of a polygamist before the world." All the public statements made by him in regard to the subject are condemnatory of it, including the Book of Mormon and the Book of Covenants—every edition of the latter work, from 1834-5 to 1845, and the Liverpool edition for 1854. He, his brother Hyrum and John Taylor are on record in 1842 and 1844, in the *Times and Seasons*, condemnatory to it; and President John Taylor's public denial and condemnation of it are as late as 1850, as you can verify by reading O. Pratt's works, including the discussion at Boulogne-Sur-Mer, France, of that year.

No woman ever testified to me in Salt Lake City, or anywhere else, that she was wife to Joseph Smith, my father, except Emma, my mother; and the only woman belonging to the Church in Utah, who ever talked to me on the subject of polygamy, stated that she was not wife or sealed woman, to either Joseph or Hyrum Smith; and was not then (1876) and had never been in polygamy at all. She affirmed at the first, as do you, that she knew, etc. But when cross-examined by me she admitted; that during Joseph Smith's lifetime she never saw him married, nor heard nor saw him treat any woman as wife in any sense, except Emma, his wife, my mother; and finally con-

fessed that she knew nothing about it. A good brother in the Utah Church, whose name I can give if it is challenged, waited upon me in Salt Lake City; and he, also, knew all about it; but he too broke down upon cross-examination, and *knew of his own personal knowledge* nothing that would implicate Joseph Smith in the practice of polygamy. The distinction between celestial marriage, (if such a thing existed at all), as it may have been held in secret among a certain class of elders as early as 1844, and the plural, or polygamic marriage doctrine of Utah, must be made; nor will it do for you, or any other apologist or advocate of Utah's peculiar system, to affirm that the latter is identical with the former. And the very special plea made by you that "in consequence of the prejudices of the Saints and the tide of persecution he well knew he would have to encounter from the outside world, wherein his life would be endangered * * * he delayed to make known this (polygamic) principle," is a most contemptible charging of cowardice upon a man, who from his fifteenth year till he was finally butchered, had lived in constant and ever present danger, and had never shrunk from any duty imposed upon him through fear—shame! Besides this, while the "boy Joseph was playing in the streets of Nauvoo," in unconscious ignorance of the existence of secretly practiced sin, (for you say "it was taught, though not publicly)," he was not alone in his ignorance; for in conversation with hundreds who lived in Nauvoo at the same time, they have invariably stated that they knew nothing of it then. In connection with this, the affidavits of as eminent persons as there are in the church at Salt Lake City, can be shown to precisely the same condition of ignorance.

When the "boy Joseph" arrived at "maturer years," and set about solving the question of his father's complicity with polygamy, he found a great many stories and myths afloat about it; and he sifted story after story, and though having met and conversed with many whom he was told knew, has failed yet to meet one who positively knew, when subjected to crucial examination; and when you assert that any woman reported to me in Utah as the wife of Joseph Smith, you make a statement not founded in truth, for no such reporting was ever done. I was in Salt Lake City for three week in the fall and early winter of

1876, and spoke four times in the "Institute" there, and publicly threw the burden of proof upon those who affirmed such complicity with the doctrine of plural marriage.

The Lord declared in the Book of Mormon that the having of wives and concubines was an "abomination" in his sight. This was revealed by God to Joseph Smith, and through him to the Church. It is precisely in this revealed light that the sons of the man through whom this revelation was made, view the subject. Another revelation through the same source reveals the will of God to be that "one man should have one wife," and one only, unless death intervene, when he is at liberty to marry again; and this, "that the earth might answer the end of its creation and be filled with the measure of man." It is in this light precisely that the sons see what was revealed through their father; and these sons affirm that they see "these (polygamic) things, as the Lord has revealed them," and in this light they have "boldly held them up" that others might see them as they are.

Why is it that Dr. W. E. McLellin, the followers of James J. Strang, and others, referred to by you as the ones whom the sons of Joseph Smith are following in the wake of, have been and are hostile to and at enmity with them? How is it that all of those whom you say these sons are following, denounce them? If there was an affinity of following, there should be of fellowship, but there is none.

But suppose that it be granted that Joseph Smith did secretly (and it is not now claimed that it was publicly declared) teach and practice "celestial marriage," or to make it as broad as you may wish it, "plural marriage," by virtue of what rule of church procedure, what revelation properly authenticated and received by the Church did he do so? If it was secretly taught to a few and practiced by him and them, it was so done contrary to the laws of God then governing the Church, which were alleged to be in accordance with the revelation of Jesus Christ through Joseph Smith; and they and he, if teaching and doing contrary to those laws, privily, were transgressors against God's will, as expressed by Him to His Church. And if it should be proved by any amount of reliable testimony that Joseph Smith did teach and practice as you assert, it proves only that he dis-

regarded that rule governing the marriage relation that was given in 1831, "at the Ohio," which rule, according to the statement made to the Church at Father Whitmer's in New York state, was to be a "law to them, suitable to their then condition, and in the New Jerusalem," and which was affirmed by Orson Pratt, the ablest of Utah's Apostles, in a discourse delivered in the tabernacle at Salt Lake City, in October, 1869, to be a "righteous law;" and would not prove that the act of being privily celestially married was a correct and righteous act, and the doctrine by which it is defended was a principle of the faith of the Church. Nor does it make any difference who the persons so secretly married, or sealed were, they each would be criminal to the known law of the Church, and the law of the land.

It is no argument in your defense to urge that because Joseph Smith did practice "plural marriage," therefore it was and is right. God condemned it in bringing the Book of Mormon to light in 1830; Christ condemned it in the law of 1831; Joseph and Hyrum Smith condemned it in 1842 and '44; John Taylor condemned it in 1844 and 1850; and I, for these and other reasons equally potent, have condemned it from my earliest entrance into public life to the present. I have organized no faction, but have raised the warning voice to Israel, worn and troubled, to return to the way in which Christ has promised peace, and so far as my opposition to the doctrine of "plural marriage" is concerned, I shall meet my "illustrious sire" without having been frightened or cajoled into a transgression of the law of the Divine Head of the Church, Christ, because it is asserted that he did. It is stated in the Book of Mormon that certain people sought to "excuse themselves" for certain practices because of "the things which were written concerning David and Solomon," and for this that people were blamed; and when you seek to excuse yourself and your people because of the things which Joseph and Hyrum did, of a like nature, your excuse is not good and you too fall under blame justly. Moses, Jacob, Jethro, Jephthah, David nor Solomon, could not sanctify evil in themselves nor Israel, nor could Joseph or Hyrum Smith or Brigham Young. And when I shall meet my father, all that I need feel concerned about is

whether my acts will bear the light of the gospel revealed through him; not whether he has had one wife or many. If he transgressed the law of God, he will by it be judged and condemned; if he obeyed, he will be rewarded; and as I treat the subject from my own manhood's standpoint and not his, I propose to take my chances with the laws accredited of God in my favor, as against any privily introduced and doubtful dogma.

Let me call your attention to some few facts in connection with temples and temple building, and then I will reply to some of your questions. The Temple at Kirtland was built, it is credibly believed, by command, and was finished and dedicated to the worship of God; and in it, as the history of the Church amply shows, the only endowment the elders ever received was bestowed. The Temple at Nauvoo, though begun at the direction of God, was not finished in any essential particular, excepting the baptismal font, according to the pattern given; and whoever presumes to congratulate himself upon any endowment bestowed in that building, must do so with the fact of its unfinished character before his eyes, and with the remembrance that there was no promise to its builders, unless it was completed within a limited time. This time expired and the building remained unfinished, was polluted, and now not one stone of superstructure or foundation remains as placed by the builders.

A more striking rebuke to the people who danced and frolicked within its walls in religion's name, and who finally sold its desecrated shrine and site into Gentile hands, can scarcely be found, except in a similar destruction witnessed at Jerusalem. The Temple at Kirtland may have filled the purpose for which it was built; but certainly the one at Nauvoo never did, unless it was designed for destruction. The spirit of "temple building" has indeed been kept by you and your people, but unfortunately for you, those temples which have been built by you are not the temples of God; nor was that one at Nauvoo accepted of Him. Indeed it could not be according to the terms of the commandment which authorized its erection, and granted only a period of time in which it was to be completed; and if not done in that time, it and the church with it, and their baptisms for the dead were to be rejected. Not having been accepted, no warrant

exists in His word for holding sacred endowments of either keys or power said to have been conferred in it.

To show that the temples of which you boast in Utah are not temples of God, I cite you to the statement of Elder Orson Pratt, who, preaching in the 17th ward meeting house, Salt Lake City, December 10th, 1876, declared that "there has not yet been a temple built which God has accepted since the Saints left the Ohio; nor will there be until a temple shall be built in the land of Zion where God has designated. The temples that we are building in these valleys will not be the temples of God, will not be accepted of him, as they have not been commanded by him to be built. That house will be built, and while some are living who lived in 1832. Not all of those who are gathered in these mountains will go back there. That portion only who are pure and upright, keep the commandment of God. The prophecies of 1844 will have been fulfilled in coming to these mountains. The great body will leave these mountains, though some will remain."

You are not at liberty to deny these statements of Orson Pratt, as at the time he delivered this discourse he was speaking for the body which you represent in your letter, and upon the subject of which you wrote. Joseph F. Smith occupied the stand with him, and I think John Henry Smith was also present. I was told afterward that the discourse was preached for my special benefit, and not having had occasion to use any of the extracts I took at the time until now, I am profoundly grateful to Mr. Pratt for the item I have here quoted, for it is exactly in point.

To your question, "How many temples has the Reorganization erected?"

Not one of the many you have erected in Utah, (Salt Lake, Saint George, San Pete), has been built by command of God; hence no more credit attaches to you for building them than is due to anybody of people who erect altars and build churches in which to worship God; only that your industry and zeal are worthy of praise, as they are also in your reclaiming the desert land, building towns, etc., and nothing more.

While you have been building temples that God did not command to be built, in a land away from the place that Mr.

Pratt states is the one upon which *The Temple* of God is to be built, which temples can not be accepted of God any more than can any other tabernacles, or houses of worship built without command, the Reorganized Church has been preaching the gospel all over the land whence the Saints were driven, and have been building *houses of worship*, which are *provided for* in the law given upon the land of Zion, to be a law unto the people of God. In doing this the elders have been teaching the gospel in its simplicity and power, as the law of God given through the Martyr provided that it should be taught; and in accordance with the command and promise made to the weary, dejected band camped on Fishing River, Missouri, have not "talked judgment, or boasted of mighty faith," but have "carefully gathered together, as many in one region of country as consistent with the feelings of the people;" and have realized the promise, "You shall find favor in the eyes of the people." In doing this, the scattered ones of the flock who failed to discover in the voice of Pres. B. Young, the voice of the Shepherd, have been returning to their allegiance to the law and the Lord, and have been made to "rejoice in the Holy One of Israel," in fulfillment of the prophecy.

The statement that Joseph Smith "desired to journey to the Rocky Mountains," is not borne out by the statements and events of the few days prior to his death; and it is easy of proof that no general exodus of the Church from Nauvoo and surrounding country to the Rocky Mountains was contemplated by him at any time, in any other sense than settlements west of the Mississippi might be made to prevent the ills that an overlarge gathering at Nauvoo might bring. Mr. Littlefield has only to read the Letter to Henry Clay, the Epistle of Brigham Young and the rest of the members of the Twelve, made immediately after the 27th of June, 1844, and recall the efforts to finish the Temple and Nauvoo House, at Nauvoo, to disprove his own position on this point.

I have no objection to the claim made by you that Joseph Smith did predict some of the Saints would go and "assist in making settlements and building cities;" or that some would live to see the Saints "become a mighty people in the midst of the Rocky Mountains." I have no more objection to the claim

by you of the fulfillment of this prophecy in your settlement in Utah, than I have had to the claim made by Mr. Pratt and others of the Utah elders that the prophecy found in Isaiah 4th is also fulfilled in the plural marriage system; only premising that the reproach complained of rises from the condition and for the causes set forth in the 3d chapter. Nor is it necessarily to the credit of those in the mountains that the prediction is fulfilled. If fulfilled, it goes to the credit of the prophet, but not necessarily to the people. The same man predicted that polygamy would prove to be the destruction of the church; and that Brigham Young would lead the people astray; both of which predictions may have been fulfilled upon the same people.

The Reorganization possesses the Temple at Kirtland, with good title thereto; and in its rehabilitation and repairing, are rebuilding the spiritual waste places of Zion; and in the places where you and your co-workers have made the name of Joseph Smith and the doctrines he taught odious, we have made converts to the truth he died to attest.

If Joseph Smith ever uttered the prophecy which you assert respecting the charge to the people to 'keep where the records' were, you have strangely confounded the word "records;" for if the word "records" means anything to the Latter Day Saints it means the Bible, Book of Mormon, Doctrine and Covenants, and has no reference to the records of names, or the Church history. To "keep with the records" is to remain in harmony with the teaching of the record of the Jews, and the record of Joseph; the teaching of Christ on both continents. In this sense the Reorganization is preeminently with the majority—God and Christ.

You are not free in Utah; not free from the laws of our common country; but are now teaching and practicing what is contrary to the laws of both God and the country. You are not free to practice what you seek to glorify as the "grand work of the latter-days;" but in the practice of plural marriage which you so improperly eulogize, you are compelled to covertly and secretly solemnize the rites of such marriages, instead of doing so in an open meeting, or at a "feast prepared for the occasion," as the Book of Covenants declares; and are forced to keep records of such marriages that you dare not produce in court;

and obliged to refuse to answer plain questions when asked them in open court, or to evade the consequences of disobedience to the law of the United States by a resort to subterfuges and mental reservations unknown to Christ's law, and unbecoming in apostates, to say nothing of Saints.

The son of Joseph Smith repudiates no doctrine that his father laid down supported by the word of God as essential to life here and salvation hereafter; but he does now, and has for all his life, repudiated as a doctrine a system for which there is no provision in the law that father left on record to govern, direct and control the Church of Christ.

Mr. Cannon, whom you are not at liberty to dispute, answered to Mr. Reed, chairman of Committee before whom he appeared in Washington a year ago last winter that the Latter Day Saints did not practice polygamy because of what was written in the Bible or Book of Mormon; but by reason of a "purported revelation to Joseph Smith authorizing it." This which you are pleased to say is the "most sacred doctrine" of my father, if it has sanction among you at all, must get it from that document; and I tell you that the word of Brigham Young alone is the only evidence you, or any of your body has that the document referred to is the one Joseph Smith had, if he ever had anything like it. And not until eight long years after Joseph Smith was dead, did Brigham Young testify, and then he says that the paper is a "copy of one that Emma Smith burned." No one else testified of the genuineness of it; and he only after the long practice of the doctrine could not be further concealed or denied; and the witness then comes to the stand burdened with the consequences of his own indulgence in the practice. Go to your Church history and find how upon the 29th day of August, 1852, eight years and two months after Joseph and Hyrum Smith were laid in their graves, Brigham Young by the introduction of plural marriage, dared to curse the church over which he had assumed a control never designed in his call as an Apostle, and to load the memory of my father with a charge of deceit, hypocrisy and cowardice, that his sons have borne in every hamlet, village, town and city where they have preached the gospel of the Son of God; and not until those sons stand before God face to face with that father and Brigham Young,

will I cease to defend the cause of Christ against that doctrine, so unjustly fastened on the faith, and against that charge upon that father's memory and their own heritage of a good name.

I am sir, yours,

JOSEPH SMITH.

LAMONI, IOWA, May 16th, 1883.

JOSEPH SMITH'S SECOND REPLY.

MR. L. O. LITTLEFIELD,

Logan City, Utah:

SIR:—There were no ordinances of washing and anointing engaged in at the meeting at Kirtland, but the Spirit which testifies that Jesus is the Christ, was there, and the peace that Christ declared that he would give to his disciples, filled the hearts and controlled the minds of the worshipers.

In your first, you stated positively that there were those women in Utah who had stated to me and my brother that they were wives to my father. This I have shown to be untrue. If your statement was correct, would it not have been better to get one or more of those women to name the time and place where such statement was made?

There was no need for me to go to Salt Lake City to find proof, if I were under the necessity to receive "universally accepted reports." Such reports are plentiful outside of Salt Lake City, and are no better there than abroad. If I am to receive "universally accepted reports," Joseph Smith was a mountebank, Brigham Young a thief and an abetter of murder, Salt Lake City a place where lust and debauchery are at home and run riot. You are too shrewd to hold that I am to be concluded by "universally accepted reports." The reach of such reports is too wide. The effect upon not only Utah and her men, but upon the origin of the Church and its founders, too wide-spreading and ruinous for you to insist upon such an acceptance.

My course in Salt Lake City was this: I was upon the streets daily. I saw many of the men whom I had seen when a boy.

I was introduced by Patriarch John Smith to many others of the citizens. I shunned no one. I declared publicly in the "Institute," in answer to the question whether my father did, or did not have a revelation commanding or permitting his Elders to have more than one wife, that I did not know. That the evidences I had so far received had failed to convince me that he had. That I did not know whether he had or not practiced plural marriage. That I threw the burden of proof where it belonged, on those who affirmed that he had the revelation, and practiced the doctrine. This was done publicly and there were members of your church present and heard me.

The denial of John Taylor at Boulogne-Sur-Mer, was coupled with the reading of the article on marriage then published in the Doctrine and Covenants, but taken out by order of President Brigham Young, *without a vote of the Church* in 1876. The intent with which it was read was to deny the charge of having in practice in Utah a system by which men of the church had more wives (with all that the name implies) than one. The language of the book is clear. "We declare that we believe that one man should have one wife, and one woman but one husband, except in case of death, when either is at liberty to marry again."

There is no mistaking this denial of Mr. Taylor's. Taken with the article on Marriage, and it is conclusive. If at that time there was in operation a system by which men were married, or sealed to women as wives, other than the one legal wife, of such a momentous character that I am fighting against truth in opposing that system, Mr. Taylor was guilty of falsehood. Technically, Mr. Taylor's denial was true; the law of the church as he well knew, was against him and his compeers. It allowed of no such marriages. The formula given in the law, required the sanction of the marriages of the church to be "in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by virtue of the laws of the country."

The reason given in the article on Marriage for the declaration of belief is that, "Inasmuch as this Church of Christ has been reproached with the crime of fornication and [the crime of] polygamy, we declare," etc.

I am thankful for your honesty in saying that the things

of which the Church was then accused were "utterly opposed to its teachings." This, I and my co-workers have been studiously striving to show, and every admission such as yours, is in keeping with our position.

The delay in my father to declare the "principle" (plural marriage) was, and is by you attributed to the "consequence of the prejudices of the brethren, and the persecution which he well knew he would have to encounter from the outside world, *wherein his life would be endangered.*" I do not construe this language. It is a plain declaration given as a reason why Joseph Smith did not make known the revelation if he had it. Was it for a like reason that Brigham Young took eight years and two months to get courage enough to make it known? You did not say that God commanded my father not to make it known, but that he delayed because he well knew that "his life would be endangered." Is not that charging him impliedly with being afraid? Whence came the prejudices of the brethren? What business had they to have prejudices against the word of the Lord? What gave rise to, or created those prejudices?

I was, as Elder Joseph F. Smith states, attentive to what Elder O. Pratt was saying in the discourse from which I quoted: I tried to conduct myself in a quiet, orderly and respectful way. I took notes of the entire sermon, and can give every important point in it from notes made at the time. I was intent to discover the talent and bent of the speaker, and was equally intent to "take advantage of anything that might be said to the profit of myself and the cause I represented." Is that a crime? If so, Elder L. O. Littlefield, and every other elder ever sent out by the Utah Church, including Joseph F. Smith, are guilty of the same crime. It is precisely what the latter has done in so sharply denying what I asserted was said by Elder O. Pratt, respecting temples. I gave it as I heard it, from notes made at the time; and I remember wondering if the statements made would be noticed and their possible effect upon me counteracted by those in charge of the meeting. When told the next day that the sermon was preached for my benefit, and asked, "What do you think of it?" as the person wished to make report of my reply to admirers of Mr. Pratt, I replied that I was pleased with it. That I had, I thought, learned one thing, and that was,

that "Orson Pratt, left to himself, would tell the truth." All I have further to add is this: I may have mistaken Elder Pratt's words. The desire to discover any possible advantage may have made me too critical and perverted his meaning. Are Elder Joseph F. Smith and the others who state that they did not hear such statement, free from such partizan bias, as he seems to think troubled me? Is his memory of a sermon to which his attention may not before have been called since the day it was delivered, likely to be any clearer of defect because of freedom from undue zeal for his cause than mine? The question of veracity may rest here.

How much better for your plea against the meeting at Kirtland, and those who met there; and your defense of the temples you are *building* in Utah, is the statement of Joseph F. Smith as to what Elder Pratt did say? "That the temple which we were building in Salt Lake City was not the Temple on which we expected the cloud would rest. Nor did we expect these glorious events to transpire in any of the temples which we were now building, or would build in Utah; but, that the temple in which these promises should be fulfilled should yet be built in Jackson county, Missouri. * * * And that not all that were living in 1832 should pass away until that temple should be built," etc., etc.

Some of those present will remember that after the services I met Elder Pratt with two or three others and was presented to him on the street near to the meeting house, and remarked to him that having been born near the close of 1832, I could hope to be one of those that might be living when that temple to which he had referred should be built. To this he replied, that to have part in it would depend on qualifications as well as age. Is this also a mistake of memory.

The question between us is the one of plurality of wives. Is the doctrine and the practice in accordance with the principles of the Church of Christ, as such principles were revealed, and said Church founded by Joseph Smith.

This question is not decided by the statement that Joseph Smith taught and practiced such doctrine, or one similar to it, in secret. Nor am I concluded as an heretic and fighter against

of which the Church was then accused were "utterly opposed to its teachings." This, I and my co-workers have been studiously striving to show, and every admission such as yours, is in keeping with our position.

The delay in my father to declare the "principle" (plural marriage) was, and is by you attributed to the "consequence of the prejudices of the brethren, and the persecution which he well knew he would have to encounter from the outside world, *wherein his life would be endangered.*" I do not construe this language. It is a plain declaration given as a reason why Joseph Smith did not make known the revelation if he had it. Was it for a like reason that Brigham Young took eight years and two months to get courage enough to make it known? You did not say that God commanded my father not to make it known, but that he delayed because he well knew that "his life would be endangered." Is not that charging him impliedly with being afraid? Whence came the prejudices of the brethren? What business had they to have prejudices against the word of the Lord? What gave rise to, or created those prejudices?

I was, as Elder Joseph F. Smith states, attentive to what Elder O. Pratt was saying in the discourse from which I quoted: I tried to conduct myself in a quiet, orderly and respectful way. I took notes of the entire sermon, and can give every important point in it from notes made at the time. I was intent to discover the talent and bent of the speaker, and was equally intent to "take advantage of anything that might be said to the profit of myself and the cause I represented." Is that a crime? If so, Elder L. O. Littlefield, and every other elder ever sent out by the Utah Church, including Joseph F. Smith, are guilty of the same crime. It is precisely what the latter has done in so sharply denying what I asserted was said by Elder O. Pratt, respecting temples. I gave it as I heard it, from notes made at the time; and I remember wondering if the statements made would be noticed and their possible effect upon me counteracted by those in charge of the meeting. When told the next day that the sermon was preached for my benefit, and asked, "What do you think of it?" as the person wished to make report of my reply to admirers of Mr. Pratt, I replied that I was pleased with it. That I had, I thought, learned one thing, and that was,


that "Orson Pratt, left to himself, would tell the truth." All I have further to add is this: I may have mistaken Elder Pratt's words. The desire to discover any possible advantage may have made me too critical and perverted his meaning. Are Elder Joseph F. Smith and the others who state that they did not hear such statement, free from such partizan bias, as he seems to think troubled me? Is his memory of a sermon to which his attention may not before have been called since the day it was delivered, likely to be any clearer of defect because of freedom from undue zeal for his cause than mine? The question of veracity may rest here.

How much better for your plea against the meeting at Kirtland, and those who met there; and your defense of the temples you are *building* in Utah, is the statement of Joseph F. Smith as to what Elder Pratt did say? "That the temple which we were building in Salt Lake City was not the Temple on which we expected the cloud would rest. Nor did we expect these glorious events to transpire in any of the temples which we were now building, or would build in Utah; but, that the temple in which these promises should be fulfilled should yet be built in Jackson county, Missouri. * * * And that not all that were living in 1832 should pass away until that temple should be built," etc., etc.

Some of those present will remember that after the services I met Elder Pratt with two or three others and was presented to him on the street near to the meeting house, and remarked to him that having been born near the close of 1832, I could hope to be one of those that might be living when that temple to which he had referred should be built. To this he replied, that to have part in it would depend on qualifications as well as age. Is this also a mistake of memory.

The question between us is the one of plurality of wives. Is the doctrine and the practice in accordance with the principles of the Church of Christ, as such principles were revealed, and said Church founded by Joseph Smith.

This question is not decided by the statement that Joseph Smith taught and practiced such doctrine, or one similar to it, in secret. Nor am I concluded as an heretic and fighter against



God or his word, when it is proven that he did secretly so teach to a few chosen ones, and secretly so practice.

The elders used to teach that if our forefathers, or our fathers did "once carry their corn to mill in one end of the bag, with a stone in the other end to balance it," it was no reason that we should do the same. That we were to do our own thinking, and whatever of doctrine was not in accord with the word of God, we were to discard. Just so.

The Bible gives the origin of the institution of marriage thus:

"And the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto man. Therefore, shall a man leave his father and his mother, and cleave unto his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh."

In the history of the life and generation of Adam as given in Genesis, there is no hint, or reference to but the one companion, one woman, one wife for him. Malachi seems to have referred to it in the language of the 14th and 15th verses of his second chapter:

"Yet is she thy companiom and the wife of thy covenant. And did not he make one? Yet had he the residue of the spirit. And wherefore one? That he might seek a godly seed."

Lamech departed from this rule and took two wives, and he became a murderer.

The commandment to Noah was completed in the saving of the means by which the earth was to be re-peopled—Noah and his wife; his three sons and one wife each—no more.

The New Testament shows the full endorsement of this by Christ.

"For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh."—Matt. 19:5. Mark 10:8. Eph. 5:31.

The Book of Mormon history shows that when Lehi and his family left their land at the command of God, they went out prepared to keep his command; Lehi and his sons and Zoram having one wife each, and that only.

Here are three occasions when God has proposed to people, or repeople a land—twice the earth, and once a distant land from the old world—and each time he shows the pattern to be

one man, one woman, one husband, one wife; twain and twain only, one flesh.

The Lord stated to Ezra Thayre and Northrop Sweet, October, 1830, that the Book of Mormon and the Holy Scriptures, were given for the instruction of his people: D. & C., page 208, Liverpool edition, 1854.

In section two of the same work, the Lord states that the Book of Mormon "Contains the fulness of the gospel of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles and to the Jews also, which was given by inspiration."

In section four, paragraph eight, it is declared that because of light treatment of things that had been received, condemnation rested upon the Church. The language is as follows:

"And this condemnation resteth upon the children of Zion, even all; and they shall remain under this condemnation until they repent and remember the New Covenant, even the Book of Mormon and the former commandments which I have given them, not only to say, but to do according to that which I have written, that they may bring forth fruit meet for their Father's kingdom, otherwise there remaineth a scourge and a judgment to be poured out upon the children of Zion; for, shall the children of the kingdom pollute my holy land? Verily, I say unto you, nay."—(Liverpool Edition.)

The date of the revelation from which this is quoted, is given as September, 1832. Going back to find some of the former commandments we discover the following: "Thou shalt love thy wife with all thy heart, and shalt cleave unto her and none else."

Elder Orson Pratt stated in a discourse delivered in the Tabernacle at Salt Lake City, October, 1869, which was published in pamphlet form, "In the early rise of this church, February, 1831, God gave a commandment to its members * * * wherein he says, thou shalt love thy wife with all thy heart, and shall cleave unto her and none else. It was given in 1831, when the one wife system prevailed among this people." In March, 1831, following, the word of the Lord came through the same man, and is as follows:

"And again I say unto you that whoso forbiddeth to marry is not ordained of God, for marriage is ordained of God; where-

fore, [for this reason], it is lawful that he should have one wife, and they twain shall be one flesh, and all this that the earth might answer the end of its creation, and that it might be filled with the measure of man, according to its creation before the world was."

These are of the former commandments, the disregard of which brought condemnation.

The fact that the revelation was given to men about to visit the Shakers, which body forbade to marry, does not prove that what is revealed is not to be taken in universal sense. And it is simply astonishing that you can so glibly dispose of its provisions. "It is *lawful* that he shall have one wife; and they twain." Can you make more than one out of this lawful provision? The revelation was given to the elders to go and preach to men [the Shakers] who did not believe in marriage. In preparing them God declares two facts; one is that marriage was ordained of Him; the other, that it is lawful for man to have one wife. This is qualified and made plain, so that no one, not blinded can fail to see, by the words "and they twain," the man and his one wife "shall be one flesh."

The men to whom it came so understood it. So will any one to whom the book is handed, upon whom the blindness has not come by reason of having treated the commandments lightly. Farther than this, the same revelation warrants the belief that such was the order according to the creation of man. The words, "unless death intervene," I obtained from section 109, paragraph 4, "except in case of death, when either is at liberty to marry again." This shows that at the time the section on marriage was written, the understanding derived from the revelations was as I have stated "one only." The word "either" is in the singular number and means one of two contracting parties. I did not interpolate the words "one only." I quoted those portions that I took from the revelations and the church articles and covenants, and gave the sense of what was evidently conveyed as being the will of God.

You write, "What a pity it is that the Lord did not take the same view of the matter that you do."

He did, Mr. Littlefield, he did beyond question. He did at that time take precisely that view. Let us see.

"The Elders shall teach the principles of my gospel, which are in the Bible and the Book of Mormon, in the which is the fulness of the gospel; and they shall observe the Covenants and Church Articles to do them.

"But the word of God burthens me because of your grosser crimes. For behold, thus saith the Lord, this people begin to wax in iniquity; they understand not the Scriptures; for they seek to excuse themselves in committing whoredoms, because of the things which were written concerning David, and Solomon his son. Behold, David and Solomon truly had many wives and concubines, which thing was abominable before me, saith the Lord; wherefore, thus saith the Lord, I have led this people forth out of the land of Jerusalem by the power of mine arm, that I might raise up unto me a righteous branch from the fruit of the loins of Joseph. Wherefore, I the Lord God, will not suffer this people to do like unto them of old. Wherefore, my brethren, hear me, and hearken to the word of the Lord: For there shall not any man among you have save it be one wife, and concubines he shall have none."

Jacob's warrant for making this declaration is this: "Jacob, get thou up into the Temple on the morrow, and dec're the word which I shall give thee unto this people."

This shows conclusively, that in 1830, when the Lord revealed the Book of Mormon, which was to become a part of the "law" of God, to "govern" his Church; and in 1830 and 1831, when the revelations I have quoted were given, He did take the same view that I do. And from what you have stated, if it be correct, He did not change His view until 1843.

You quote the revelation of God in which his will is set forth, and then immediately turn and justify the plural wife system "because of the things which were written of David," the very thing reprobated by the Lord as declared by Jacob.

Let us reverse the reasoning. You quote the language of Nathan:

"And I gave thy master's house, and thy master's wives into thy bosom, and gave thee the house of Israel and of Judah; and if that had been too little I would moreover have given unto thee such and such things."

You then say: "From the foregoing is it not evident that

to assert that plural marriage is a sin, is to say that God is a sinner?

How much wiser and better is it, or how much more consistent to charge God with using duplicity and deceit? This you certainly do when you say, or intimate that the revelation "it is lawful that a man shall have one wife," was not intended as a restriction, as in the case of the woman, "but one husband." In the same way you charge God with duplicity, in evading the force of Jacob's declaration: -

"Wherefore, if I will raise up a righteous seed unto me, I will command my people; otherwise, they shall hearken unto these things."

In this there is no hint that God will change the rule then established. For my part, when you prove that God has dealt deceitfully with the Church, as such construction of implied, reserved and double meanings would certainly do if they were correct, you have proved Him to be a hypocrite, which you practically charge Him with being—and in such case He is no better than a sinner—of the two, a hypocrite is more despicable than a sinner.

I do not need to say that plural marriage is a sin on unjust or unfair grounds. God, through Jacob, declares positively that it is an abomination. "Truly, David and Solomon had many wives and concubines which thing was abominable before me." Jacob called it a "grosser crime." The section on marriage adopted by the assembled quorums of the Church in 1835, called it a "crime."

If he who commits a crime is not a sinner, pray tell me what is he? He who commands a crime is as guilty as he who commits it, if the command is obeyed. If God command Joseph Smith to take more wives than Emma, while she lived, He commanded a thing that He had forbidden by a revelation called by Orson Pratt in 1869, a "holy law." Mr. Pratt said:

"If the members of the Church had undertaken to vary from the law given in 1831, to love their one wife with all their hearts, and to cleave to none other, they would have come under the curse and condemnation of God's holy law."

This holy law given of God was the exact counterpart of the one given to Lehi.

Mr. Pratt, (a Daniel come to judgment), said in 1869:

"The Lord, through his servant Lehi, gave a command that they should have but one wife. By and by, after the death of Lehi, some of his posterity began to disregard the *strict law* that God had given to their father, and took more wives than one, and the Lord put them in mind, through his servant Jacob, one of the sons of Lehi, of this law, and told them that they were transgressing it, and then referred to David and Solomon as having committed abominations in His sight."

History repeats itself, for now, I, the son of Joseph Smith, through whom the "holy law" cited by Mr. Pratt came from God, which commanded the men of the Church to have but one wife each, now call the attention of a people claiming to be of that Church, and remind them that they are transgressing the law by taking more wives than one. I further declare to that people, in the language of the Book of Mormon, which that people are commanded to hear, the taking of more wives than one is "abominable" before God.

It is proved beyond question that this monogamic rule prevailed in the Church from 1830 to 1843, (at any rate), by command of God. Hence, if he acted like himself and is unchangeable, he could not in 1843, give a law contrary to it. If he did he must be changeable. This destroys his character as God. Besides this, the history shows that three separate times did God in starting the peopling of the world fix the status "one man, one woman, one husband, one wife." Christ, the lawgiver of this dispensation, sanctioned it in the New Testament, and in the Doctrine and Covenants; and hence is not a party to this new revelation that brands his father with being a changeable Jehovah.

Joseph F. Smith, yourself and others are alarmed and indignant at me when I put words into Elder O. Pratt's mouth that indicate a change of sentiment in him, and you argue that he could not have said what I stated that he did say, because it was not like him. Please be as consistent in your argument respecting God. "I am God and change not" is his own language concerning himself. Nor am I in fault if I hurl this argument back at you that was the rallying cry of the elders in my fath-

er's day. "God is unchangeable, hence the gospel is now what it was in Christ's day."

The history shows that the wives of David's master fell into his hands by the fortunes of war. As a conqueror he slept in the bed of his captive, or slain enemies and ruled in their seats of power. Nathan did not give them to David as President Young gave wives to his faithful adherents. The record does not show that any such giving took place. The house of Israel and the house of Judah with the wives of the captive kings were given in a similar sense, as were the house of Saul and his wives. But how fatal the gift. The same God before whom he had done abominable things, would not permit that he should build a house unto him. His wives forsook him. His son *betrayed him*, and debauched his wives. The same Nathan who you state gave the wives of David's master to the king, took the same wives and gave them to David's neighbor. Shimei, the son of Gera, cursed him at the command of God on account of the "blood of the house of Saul" whose wives he had won by conquest. The dread consequences of his sin followed. The like results followed the successful son, for his wives drew his heart away from God, and he perished as a foolish old man.

I thank you for the statement you quote from the history of Joseph Smith, of date October 5th, 1843.

In this statement my father urges that persons teaching, or preaching, or practicing the doctrine of plurality of wives should be tried. What for? Because, as Hyrum wrote in 1844, "No such doctrine is taught here" (Nauvoo).

This statement agrees perfectly with the one made by Elder Wm. Marks, that some time before my father's death, he told him to go before the High Council, and there prefer charges against such men; and that he would go upon the stand and proclaim against the doctrine; as it was from the devil and would destroy the church if it was not put down. This was either a piece of clerical duplicity and deceit, or was a genuine effort to put a stop to what was had in secret of which knowledge had come to him. Nor does it take on the form of implicating himself as one of the guilty ones. It does not warrant the conclusion that he was himself one of those to be proceeded against by President Marks before the Council. Nor is it common sense

to say that Joseph Smith was so great a bungler as to go on the stand and publicly denounce what he was secretly practicing, if such practice was known.

The testimonies from the witnesses you offer I am familiar with; and many of them will not bear cross examination; as I could easily demonstrate if I had the witnesses in a court where hearsay, mental reservations and other men's statements can not be affirmed as knowledge.

It is unnecessary to attempt to prove that Joseph Smith secretly taught and practiced celestial or plural marriage, or polygamy. For when that is proved, the issue remains unchanged. All that could be effected by it, so far as I am concerned, would be to lessen my respect for him as a man, and give me one more heart pang to bear through life. And if it be proved that he dictated the alleged revelation, or the "copy" which is all that you can claim, it would not prove either the revelation, or the doctrine to be of God, or binding on Latter Day Saints. I am not so particularly strenuous to assert my father's innocence. He may have been guilty, I prefer not to believe it. But if he was, I shall not evade the issue, nor my duty as I know it because of that guilt. Sin is not made legal, or lovely in my eyes because my father did it.

I admit God's power to change. I do not admit his right to change his law, without reserving to myself the right to declare him changeable against the teaching of his own word. I do not believe that God has the right to lie. I do not believe that Jesus Christ, his Son, has the right to lie. I do not believe that either has the right to say that one thing is heaven's law in 1831 and that another and contrary thing is heaven's law in 1843. I do not believe that the revelation, so-called, came from God. But if it did, it is an unjust and cruel thing; so totally unlike the "new covenant," the Book of Mormon, that it makes God to stultify himself. The new covenant, the everlasting gospel, has provisions for life and salvation open to all. This revelation has provisions for only a few. The gospel provides for all men, this revelation for a few only.

But, suppose that it be conceded that the revelation came from God and that Joseph Smith "had the keys of the power" to administer in the things named in it. That he was the "only

one on earth" at the time authorized to receive revelations from God as to who might, and to say who should not receive wives under its privileges. Who authorized Brigham Young to do it? He did not receive it from Joseph Smith. It was not conferred in the revelation on any one but Joseph Smith. Brigham's appointment by the people to be the president did not confer it. He declared that he "was not a prophet, nor the son of one." Who gave Joseph Smith's wives to be Brigham Young's wives? What business had he to take them to himself?

The lodging of such a power in one man's hands—that of dictating that one here may, or shall take such and such a woman, or such women to wife; and that one there may or shall not take any—is a most dangerous thing to do. It offers to such a man an opportunity and an inducement to prostitute his prophetic character to greed, love of power and the lust of the flesh, that may not be resisted. Joseph Smith may not long have been free from such influences; and it is possible that the eleven months that he exercised it, if your theory is a true one, witnessed his corruption. That Brigham Young in the exercise of it for the twenty-five years between 1852 and 1877 was free from its baleful powers, is more than I believe, and were the history of its workings fully known, I feel assured its own friends would be appalled.

I deny that Brigham Young was ever lawfully called and authorized to act under the provisions of that revelation. Joseph Smith did not designate him as his successor. The laws of the church as found in the Doctrine and Covenants at Joseph Smith's death did not confer such authority. The revelation itself did not confer it. Nor does it contain any provision for a successor: "And I have appointed unto my servant Joseph to hold this power in the *last days*." This is the precise language of the revelation itself and limits the powers to Joseph Smith and him alone. The manner in which the document came to the people was irregular. The way Brigham Young became possessed of the "copy" is of doubtful propriety. From these and other reasons plainly to be deduced it is safe to conclude that if the revelation did come from God, it became inoperative at the death of Joseph Smith.

As conclusive proof that the "copy" did not come legiti-

mately into the church rules, I quote section 28, paragraphs 12 and 13, Doctrine and Covenants, Utah edition of 1876.

"For, behold, these things have not been appointed unto him, neither shall anything be appointed unto any of this church contrary to the church covenants. For all things must be done in order, and by common consent in the church, by the prayer of faith."

This revelation never passed the ordeal required. There is no pretense that it did. Orson Hyde quoted the language of Joseph Smith, at the trial of Sidney Rigdon in 1844. "Joseph gave us the plan. When all the quorums are assembled and organized in order, let the revelation be presented to the quorums. If it pass one, let it go to another, and if it pass that, to another, and so on until it has passed all the quorums; and if it pass the whole without running against a snag, you may know it is of God."—*Times and Seasons*, vol. 5, pages 649, 665.

That Joseph Smith did not think that the Temple at Kirtland had filled the object of its building is seen by reading the prayer offered at its dedication. See Doctrine and Covenants, edition of 1876, sec. 109.

Hyrum Smith, writing from Nauvoo to a member in Kirtland, referred to it thus, as the saying of the Lord, "That I may hide you from mine indignation that shall scourge the wicked, and then I will send forth and build up Kirtland, and it shall be polished and refined according to my word."

In your first letter the inference was conveyed that the Reorganized Church was sadly derelict in duty, or in goodness because they had built no Temples. And that those in Utah were necessarily the people of God because they were building Temples. Let me repeat that no special revelation has commanded the erection of Temples at Manti, Logan, St. George and Salt Lake City. The authority claimed by you in your reply is said to be a general one. Whence came this general commandment? The rule was, that whenever any house was to be built to the Lord it was first commanded. This was the case of the Tabernacle, Solomon's Temple, the one at Kirtland and the one at Nauvoo; and the command given in 1841 does not read, "my people are always commanded to build Temples unto my name." The language of the command is special, and is of

a similar nature to the one referred to by Jacob: "If I will raise up a righteous seed I will *command* my people," showing that the Lord purposes to be obeyed. This is seen by the text of sec. 124, par. 39, of your edition of the Doctrine and Covenants for 1876. This shows that the washings, baptisms, statutes and judgments, etc., are "ordained by the ordinance of my *holy house* which my people are always commanded to build unto my holy name."

The word *house* is singular, and in paragraph 40 the Lord said, "Let this house be built unto my name." This confines the command to the "house" at Nauvoo; and does not warrant one at Salt Lake City, Manti, St. George or Logan. It is not a general command to build Temples.

It is shown by the quotation that Elder Joseph F. Smith makes from Mr. Pratt for December 10th, 1876, that no one of the Temples in Utah is the one spoken of by the Prophet as the one to be built in Zion in the generation counting from 1832, or "while some are living who lived in that year." This shows that Utah is not Zion. But the law, the general one under which you claim to have been building declares that it is "in Zion and her stakes," that those places (houses) where baptisms for the dead, etc., are to be performed. The free and proper rendering of this statement, "which my people are always commanded to build;" is that the people shall not attempt to build, without a command including place and manner of building. That God's people shall not presume to build a house, a Temple unto the Lord, unless such house shall first be ordered by him. If it is at any time essential to his purposes that one should be built he will command it to be done.

That you have built many does not prove that any one of them was commanded. If only one had been built, it might be a possible presumption that it had been ordered. The building of more than one renders the presumption good that none were commanded. Another thing that is indicative that the Temples in Utah are not accepted of God is this:

"And if my people will hearken unto my voice, and unto the voice of my servants whom I have appointed to lead my people, behold, verily I say unto you, they shall not be moved out of their place."

The people were "moved out of their place." The only conclusion that can be drawn from this is that they did not hearken; that there was something done that was not commanded, or something commanded that was left undone. You can take which of these horns you please. The fact of disobedience remains.

If you will look up the sayings of Pres. Young, you will find the report of a sermon delivered at St. George, January 1st, 1877. In that you will find something like this:

"We that are here are enjoying a privilege that we have no knowledge of any other people enjoying since the days of Adam, that is to have a *Temple completed*, wherein all the ordinances of the House of God can be bestowed upon his people. . . . We built one at Nauvoo. I could pick out several before me now that were there when it was built, and know just *how much was finished* and what was done. It is true we left brethren there with instructions to *finish it*, and they got it *nearly completed* before it was burned; but the Saints did not enjoy it."

Brigham Young knew that the Temple at Nauvoo was not finished. He knew that when it was burned it had been let to a company of men who proposed establishing a school of some sort in it. He knew that it had not been accepted according to the terms of the revelation by which it was authorized to be built. He knew also that no command to build Temples in Utah had been given. There is no general law by which the people were commanded to build Temples. Houses of worship they might erect. They were and are necessary for the spiritual well being of the people. In them the principles of the New Covenant; the Book of Mormon, the Gospel may be taught; but in them no secret endowments, nor oaths, nor vows, nor covenants, not provided for in the gospel, are to be administered.

The people of Utah are entitled to credit for the energy and industry they have displayed in the erection of those places for worship. So are the members of the Reorganization for the building of the houses of worship they have built.

"The law of the Church is that if God can reveal one thing He can another."

This is another of your mistakes; there is no such law. The teaching of the Church and the tradition of the elders was

that if God had ever had the power and did reveal Himself to His people in any age, He could do so in any and every other age and dispensation. But that whenever He does reveal Himself, such revelation will be in harmony with all former revelations on the same subject. That He will not contradict Himself; that later revelations of His mind will not be in conflict with those before given expressive of His will.

This is "common sense." Such a position permits men to build upon the revelations of the Scriptures, the Book of Mormon, and the revelations in the Book of Covenants, without fear that in a day or two God may change His mind, and give a different and conflicting command making vain and void their work. If God can to-day reveal one thing as lawful and pleasing to Him, and next week reveal the opposite as being lawful and pleasing, there is an end to trust and constancy. If He can and does to-day declare that certain things are displeasing to him, that and to-morrow or next week He can declare other things are "abominable before Him," that these very things are lovely in His sight, what criterion is left to judge by in regard to what is pleasing to God. If He can make certain things lawful to-day and next year make them unlawful, He can not justly hold man accountable for disregarding His edicts; as there can be no certainty respecting them.

It is because of this claim for the changeable character of God and His laws that you and your compeers make, that I oppose the plural marriage system. The books and teachings of the Church up to the death of my father give me good warrant to deny such claim for changeability on God's part. If my father did what you charge him with doing, he changed from what he was when he translated the Book of Mormon. If God gave the revelation on plural marriage, as you construe it, he changed from what he was in 1830-31.

There are things which God can not do and still be God. He can not lie. He can not be ignorant of what he does. If he knew what he was doing in 1830-31 he knew what was righteous and true. If he gave the revelation of 1843, he knew that it made the law of 1831 void and foolish. If he gave it he knew it was contradictory of the rule given to Lehi and Joseph and to Northrop Sweet. If he did not know this, he was very

forgetful of himself, and unmindful of the "prejudices of the brethren," prejudices born of the law already given. If he did not forget he knew that Nauvoo, Far West, Jackson county, were all in territory where the "holy law" of the one wife for one man had obtained, under a constitution written by wise men "raised up by him to do that very work." He knew if he had not forgotten it, that he had told the Church that "they had no need to break the law of the land" to keep the law of God. And I firmly believe that it was for the very purpose of defeating the treachery of the betrayer of the brethren that the protection of the United States was providentially thrown over the territory ceded by Mexico to the United States after the conquest of Scott, and the occupation of California by Commodore Stockton.

Your wishes that I might be brought to see the righteousness of the positions you occupy, I reciprocate. I would to God that you and all others of scattered Israel might see that the revelation of God to me by which my courses of opinion and life have been opposed to those of the one time associates of my father, was and is in harmony with His will as revealed to that father, and the rule by which he proposes to people the earth with a righteous people.

Yours,

JOSEPH SMITH.

LAMONI, Iowa, June 15th, 1883.

JOSEPH SMITH'S THIRD REPLY.

HE DENIES THAT ABRAHAM AND MOSES WERE POLYGAMISTS.

MR. L. O. LITTLEFIELD,

Logan City, Utah:

SIR:—You say in your last that you prefer the plain word of the Lord to any statement that I may make. Let me give you some plain words of the Lord:

“Behold, David and Solomon truly had many wives and concubines, which thing was abominable before me, saith the Lord.” . . . “Hear me and hearken to the word of the Lord: For there shall not any man among you have save it be one wife, and concubines he shall have none; for I the Lord God delighteth in the chastity of women.” B. of M., Book of Jacob 2:6. “Behold, the Lamanites, your brethren, whom ye hate, because of their filthiness, and the cursings which have come upon their skins, are more righteous than you, for they have not forgotten the commandment of the Lord, which was given unto our fathers, that they should have save it were one wife, and concubines they should have none.” Book of Jacob 2:8.

“And they shall remain under this condemnation until they repent and remember the new covenant, even the Book of Mormon and the former commandments which I have given them, not only to say, but to *do* according to that which I have written.” D. and C., sec. 4, par. 8, Liverpool Ed.

In none of your arguments have you attempted to answer these very “plain words.” There is not a line of teaching from 1830 to June 27th, 1844, in the books of the church, the printed journals, or the published sermons or pamphlets of the Elders, that contains a reference to the marriage relation, but what contemplates it as monogamic.

You admit that you can not prove from the Scriptures that Adam, Noah, or Lehi had more than one wife. Of what weight in the scale of argument is your statement that you can find other men named in the history who had. The Creator evidently knew just how he proposed to people the earth; and the fact that at the outset he formed but the two, Adam and Eve, should be conclusive evidence both as to the intention of Deity and the fact. How ignorantly you write when you state that "God made man polygamic." "The history of this world in all its generations proves it." With the ink scarcely dry in the sentence admitting that Adam was the creation of God, and Eve formed for his one companion, and that you can not prove that either he, or Noah, or Lehi had more than one, you say 'God created man polygamic.' What new cosmos is this of which you write? Do you expect me to believe you sincere when you so pervert the very words of the history?

The very reason assigned for the destruction by the flood is a denunciation of polygamy. "The sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose." Gen. 6: 2.

This is the opening count in the indictment. The inspired translation by Joseph Smith states that the Lord told Noah, "The daughters of thy sons have sold themselves, for behold mine anger is kindled against the sons of men, for they will not hearken to my voice." Gen. 8: 3.

The voice (word) of the Lord was "they twain shall be one flesh," in direct accord with the creation. The revelation to the church through Joseph, the Seer, was in keeping with this; "that it (the earth) might be filled with the measure of man, according to his creation, before the world was made." B. of C., sec. 45, par. 3, Liverpool Ed. This proves plainly that when God made man he made him monogamic. But man corrupted his way before the Lord. The Lord's spirit quit striving with them. The flood came and destroyed them, except Noah, a man "perfect in his generations," who "walked with God." The generations of Noah were monogamic. God saved them that he might establish his covenant with them and thus preserve a righteous seed to people the earth. This is to me, and I think

should be to all who deal honestly with the Bible, a condemnation of plural marriage.

How can you, Mr. Littlefield, take these two examples in the history of the world before your eyes, and say that God "created man polygamic?" The intent was to people the earth, and we are not to suppose that it was intended to people it with a corrupt seed. He chose the system and placed the two beings with whom he began the work upon the earth, and instituted marriage. He repeated the warning by actual demonstration in the selection of a family of monogamists, Noah and his wife, his three sons and one wife each. He led Lehi out of the midst of a people whom you say was polygamic, with the purpose stated, that he might seek a godly seed. He gave the rule first by example, Lehi and his wife, his sons and one wife each. He confirmed it secondarily, by the command which I have quoted. And yet you have the hardihood to impugn the wisdom of such creation and such precept by declaring polygamy the rule. And you further say that God sanctioned polygamy.

If God designed plural marriage to be the rule, why did he not so make them at the outset? You are the one who is indulging in sophistry, not I. I give you the plain word and the examples in history, and you evade them by sophistry that is as dark as it must be damaging.

If you still urge that plural marriage is the natural law governing man, it is but proper for me to urge that you have no Scriptural ground upon which to defend the marriage institution, and the right of a man to have more wives than one, should insure the right of a woman to have more husbands than one—and the step to the absence of any restriction as founded in Scripture is not far removed. It will puzzle you to trace from any history in your possession, either sacred or profane, the exclusive right of man to choose his female companions to any direct revelation from God. If it is left to the decision of the natural appetites of man, promiscuity will be proven against you.

Your statement that "three quarters of the human family accept it (polygamy) as the natural law of marriage," is a singular one. Does that prove it right? The same proportion discards Jesus as the Christ, too; does that prove the statement

that He is, untrue? What nation accepting the Bible and Christ accept polygamy as the natural law of marriage?

You charge upon the other quarter of the human family that they have "adopted in place of honorable polygamy, a vile, a damnable and a God-accursed substitute," is contemptible. You point to the exception in monogamic nations, and call it the rule. What you allude to, and what is known as "the social evil," is in monogamic nations the perversion of the rule, and opposed to law.

I quote from your letter: "You denounce celestial marriage as a crime against mankind and a sin against God. We assert that God never has so denounced it but has approved it, sanctioned it, encouraged it, legalized it and made special laws for its direction; that the polygamist child was always recognized as legitimate."

You certainly pervert the record. Take the instance of Abraham, one of your cases cited, in proof. No prophet gave Hagar to Abraham. Sarai, the patriarch's only wife grew jealous of her barrenness; she conceived the idea of obtaining a child by proxy, and so she took a slave, and put her in her place. Abram listened to his wife (so did Adam) and when fruit resulted from this connection with Hagar, Sarai bewailed her *wrong*. What was this wrong? If God had restrained her from bearing, was she in fault? No. Her wrong was in forgetting the sacredness of the marital relation. When the Lord speaks in regard to this son, he puts a very strange blessing upon him. To prevent the inheritance from going out in this fashion the Lord gave Sarah a son, Isaac. In him was the covenant established, though Ishmael was the first born. The Lord then speaks concerning this secondary wife, the slave-concubine, and tells Abraham to do as Sarah enjoined, "cast out this bond woman," which he did. Ishmael dwelt away from his father's house, and was a wild man.

Abraham was not a polygamist. He had no wife by the institution of marriage, but Sarah, while Sarah lived. Sarah was dead when Abraham married Keturah, by whom he also had children. But the history states that in order to put his evil example away from Isaac, Abraham sent the sons of the *concubines* he had away from his son to the east country, and they are

not reckoned in his posterity. This disposal of the matter of Abraham's departure from the monogamic rule, is in favor of the thought that God did not approve of it. No prophet gave him a second wife while Sarah lived; nor does the record show that there had been a change from the rule as given at the first.

Isaac's life affords you no comfort. Rebecca must have ruled her house in respect to her husband's wives, as Joseph Smith's wife Emma, would have done, if he had not, as you assert, secretly sinned against her.

The case of Joseph is only favorable to your view in seeming. He was the son of Rachel, the only legal wife Jacob had. In the 46th chapter of Genesis, where the enumeration of Israel's children takes place, none is called Jacob's wife but Rachel. Gen. 46:19. The blessing was with Joseph, Jacob's first born of his legal wife. No prophet gave Jacob his plural wives, or sealed his concubines to him. Nor is any law cited by which any such connection was authorized.

You are well aware that all the laws of Moses were given under the code and were called the "carnal commandments, which the Lord, in his wrath, caused to continue with the house of Aaron among the children of Israel till John." And Christ, speaking of the law of divorcement, a part of your polygamic creed, said: "Moses, for the hardness of your hearts, wrote you this precept." It is equally clear from the traditions of the church that the law of carnal commandments, which you cite as regulating polygamy, was added "because of transgression." The hearts of Israel were hardened and God swore "in his wrath that they should not enter into his rest."

In reply to your question respecting the Lord's portion of the spoil named in Numbers, chapter thirty-five, I am quite willing that the portion that went to Eleazer should be "a heave offering to the Lord;" if you know what a "heave offering" was. Of the part that went to the Levites, the record is silent as to what the Levites did with them; but the inference that they were used as wives is far fetched. They were slaves taken in war, and the thought that they could only be used as wives, or as concubines, shows the lustful tendency of the polygamic mind.

I do not mean to tell you, or the world, that God ever used polygamy in any sense to raise up seed unto him; but that in

every instance where he attempted to raise up seed unto him, the rule adopted by him was one man, one wife. It is because of that that he calls polygamy abominable. I do not consent that he ever used that means for that object, and fully believe that you can not show a single instance, or command, in proof, except the so-called revelation of 1843, and that is of such doubtful parentage that I do not accept it as evidence in point.

Moses was not a polygamist. There is nothing in the history to show that Moses had any other wife than Zipporah. She was not of the Israelitish host, for he had obtained her of Jethro, the prince of Midian, a Cushite, or Ethiopian, and supposed to be a descendant of Abraham by Keturah. The presumption is fair that Zipporah and the Ethiopian woman are one and the same.

There is no question but what when you persistently cite David and Solomon as polygamic examples, that you do so for an excuse, whatever you may pretend to the contrary. And to show you how superficial has been the reading, in regard to David, let me detail a little of his history.

Saul was jealous of the praise bestowed upon David for slaying the Philistine, and made an attempt on his life with a javelin before he had yet become a married man. 1 Sam. 18: 7-11. Saul offered him his elder daughter Merab to wife; but cheated him out of her, giving her to Adriel. Then Michal, another of Saul's daughters, loved David, and was his first wife, for whom he paid an hundred trophies taken from the Philistines. Notwithstanding this marriage Saul became more and more David's enemy. 1 Sam. 18:29. This hatred of Saul continued until Saul's death, before which David had twice spared Saul's life when the fortunes of war had placed him in his power, David having gathered numbers to his standard. Saul had taken Michal from David and given her to Phaltiel, and then David took Nabal's widow and Ahinoam; but there is no proof that Samuel, or Nathan had been the agent through whom he took these wives. David was crowned king of Judah and reigned seven years at Hebron. During this time war ensued between the armies of David and Saul's son Ishbosheth; Abner the general of Israel, Joab for David or Judah. The war between the house of David and the house of Saul was a long one. See

2 Sam. 3:1 and 6. More than this the war between these hosts did not cease until Ishbosheth was slain; then the tribes were united under the conqueror, and as such he reigned in Hebron seven years over Judah and in Jerusalem over Judah and Israel for thirty-three years. David would not treat with Abner until Michal, the daughter of Saul, married first to him, then to Phaltiel, had been re-delivered to him. Phaltiel, her second husband, followed the troop crying after his wife until Abner made him return. Here was one woman in Israel that had two husbands; and it was not Samuel or Nathan that gave them in either case.

Again; it is in proof that Abner had one of Saul's concubinal wives as his. Her name was Rispah. The record further states David gave unto Mephibosheth "all that pertained to Saul and to all his house." He did this in pursuance of his oath to Saul that he would not "cut off his seed," and Mephibosheth was the son of Jonathan, the grandson of Saul. 2 Sam. 9:9, 13. Ziba, "the servant of Saul," was doubtless the steward of his house; and as such was in charge of all that belonged to Saul; and he was made the witness of the transfer of the house (family and possessions, slaves, wives, concubines and all) of Saul to his legal representative. There is no evidence to show that David had any of the family of Saul as his *wives*, except Michal, Saul's daughter. I did not use the words "conqueror" and "fortunes of war" without good warrant; as any man among you, not a polygamist *ingrain*, will acknowledge, if he will read the record for himself.

If the example of David is good, permit me to enquire, who succeeded to the house of Pres. B. Young? He left houses, lands, wives and children. He did not die fighting the Philistines, in manhood's prime, in the din of battle, but in his bed after he had disposed of his worldly goods by will, leaving no portion of the moneys held by him as a ruler in Israel to the congregation of the Lord. Did Mr. Taylor inherit to his master's house? Did he receive the wives of Pres. Young to be his wives? To whom were the wives of Pres. H. C. Kimball married after his death? Who entered in upon the heritage of wives of Pres. G. A. Smith and Orson Pratt? Please tell me who obtained the wives of Joseph Smith? When and why?

One other will suffice for the present. If the question of your salvation, or mine depended upon the character of Joseph Smith, my father, rather than upon our own acts, then the sentence you think betrays my hardness of heart might never have been written by me; but when you reflect that whatever Joseph Smith may have been personally, good or bad, is not to be the test when you and I are to be tried, you must admit that the issue is not whether Joseph Smith was a polygamist; *but, is the doctrine of God?*

I expect the truth to win in this controversy. If in the final arbitrament I am found in error, I shall submit. If in the right, as I now believe I am, I shall be content without being malicious.

Yours,

JOSEPH SMITH.

LAMONI, Iowa, July 30th, 1883.

WHEN the Utah Mormon authorities refused to publish this last letter in reply, President Joseph Smith penned an editorial, explanative of the apparent reasons for such refusal, a portion of which is as follows:—

"The pith of this reason for declining to publish our last letter in the *Utah Journal* will be seen when it is contemplated that Mr. Littlefield is himself attached to the Journal Office, either on the editorial or working staff of employees, or is a joint stockholder and one of the management, or possibly both, which we are inclined to believe. * * *

"The Editor of the *Deseret News*, while affecting to despise the weakness of our letters, came to the help of Mr. Littlefield and added to that gentleman's effort the weight of his own argumentation, certainly giving to an observer the impression that there was some ground to fear lest some of the joint readers of the *News* and *Journal* might be led away by 'Mr. Smith's sophistries.'

"The day was when Mormonism feared no investigation. That day, alas! passed away when somebody under the shades of *Secrecy*, introduced that [Polygamy] which required darkness and double dealing to establish it, and now requires *secrecy, duplicity, and unfair dealing* to perpetuate it.

"Elder Littlefield expresses great anxiety that we may be able to see the error of our way, and retrace our steps to the acceptance of what we have been trying to overthrow. The *News* man also reads us a homily about being governed by antipathies and convictions, forgetful of the fact that controls all men, namely, what he loves he fosters and protects; what he hates he repels. * * *

"Both Mr. Littlefield and the *News* man assume that we are and must be convinced, and that our continued denial and resistance are the result of sheer obstinacy and willfulness. Who is the best judge in regard to the convictions of one's own mind? The person stating his convictions, or the person holding adverse convictions? Suppose we were to state that both Elder Littlefield and the Editor of the *Deseret News* knew that the doctrine of plural marriage was from the devil, originated with the ruler of the sulphurous regions, and that their present advocacy of it was due to their willful obstinacy, and against their convictions as to its origin and its ruinous tendencies, would they—would anybody else think us to be the proper judge of what those men really believed upon conviction?"

"It seems to be a mortifying and vexing fact to the leading men of the Utah Polygamic Church, that the wife, (legal and only wife), and sons of Joseph Smith have refused to bow the knee to the Baal of unrighteousness set up in the valleys of the mountains, to be worshiped in practice only 'in Utah,' and not anywhere else. And in the frantic endeavors of these men of Utah to convince and overawe us into a cessation of opposition, if not an acceptance of their pet dogma, they get exasperated, and shout: 'Your father did it! Your father did it! You know he did! You know you are not honest when you deny it! We bear our testimony to you that he did! That ought to convince you; and it does.'" * * *

JOSEPH SMITH'S FOURTH REPLY.

MR. L. O. LITTLEFIELD,
Logan City, Utah:

Sir.—I am not surprised that you do not like the continued reiteration of the Word of God from the Book of Mormon. That book is one of the essential features of Mormonism. It should be to you and all other Mormons what the Koran is to Mohammedans, the Bible to Christians—the end of dispute. Without it the Mormon Church had not been born. It is the Golden Bible to the devout Mormon. From it I have the undoubted right to select those portions of the text that confirm and sustain my faith in Christ as primitive Mormonism has revealed him. The word of God to the Church, in the revelation charging the Church to remember the Book of Mormon, to "do according to that which I have written," is directly applicable to the matter in dispute between us. In that revelation the will of God touching the conduct of the Church is plainly stated—too plainly to suit you, hence your dislike to my quoting it. The only reason I assign for not quoting the whole, as complained of

by you, is that I desired to make my letter as short as possible to cover the points I tried to make. At the risk of invoking another reproof from you for quoting such passages as suit my side of the controversy, I cite:

"And now it came to pass that the people of Nephi, under the reign of the second king, began to grow hard in their hearts, and indulge themselves somewhat in wicked practices, such as like unto David of old, desiring many wives and concubines, as also Solomon, his son. * * * Wherefore, I, Jacob, gave unto them these words as I taught them in the temple, having *first obtained mine errand from the Lord.*"

This errand from the Lord, Jacob essayed to perform. In doing so he states the object for which the people were led out of Jerusalem:

"Wherefore, thus saith the Lord, I have led this people forth out of the land of Jerusalem, by the power of mine arm, that I might *raise up unto me a righteous branch* from the fruit of the loins of Joseph."—B. of M., Jacob 2: 6, 7.

The nature of the corruption existing among the Nephites, which was reproved by Jacob, was stated by him at the time his reproof was given. Your explanation of it is not according to the record itself. Whatever credit others may give to you as qualified to explain away the damaging effect of the words of the Lord through Jacob, I do not trust you. The arts of sophistry employed by you are too transparent, the results too ruinous to be accepted. To show you what I mean by this, I quote what you assert I refrained from doing for fear the "keystone of the arch of my argument would fall out."

Wherefore, [for which reason], said the Lord, if I will raise up seed unto me, I will command my people; otherwise [in a different manner, under different circumstances, in different respects], they shall hearken unto these things."

Instead of the closing clause of this sentence being a prophecy, as you assert, it bears no mark warranting such assertion. The purpose of "raising up a righteous branch unto him," had already been stated by the Lord. It was for this that he led them out from the people at Jerusalem. It was for this that he reproved their departure from the law given at the outset. The language of Jacob's commendation of the Lamani-

tes, in which he states, "For they have not forgotten the commandment of the Lord, which was given unto our fathers, that they should have, save it were one wife, and concubines they should have none," points to that rule as one commanded long before Jacob's indictment against the Nephites, and shows its imperative character. The corruption which Jacob reproves is precisely that of David and Solomon, which God said he would not suffer. The command is sweeping and comprehensive: "There shall not any man among you have save it be one wife, and concubines he shall have none." The reason assigned, "For I, the Lord God, delighteth in the chastity of women."

The sophistry upon this question is on your part, not mine. The language of the text will not bear the strained construction you put upon it. The whole sentence taken with its connections can mean nothing more than this: The Lord had wearied of their sin: He set the task upon the prophet Jacob to reprove it. In doing this He uses plain language and does not indulge in double meaning words. That which he declares is like what he declared elsewhere. I am God, I will command my people. They shall hearken unto my words. This is the only force the words have. The word "otherwise," upon which you predicate your statement that it is a prophecy, because it suits your side of the case, used in two of its senses, as given by Webster, is equivalent to the saying that "under different circumstances," and "in different respects," my people 'shall hearken unto these things.' The statement, "I will command my people," is affirmative only of the fixed determination of God to be obeyed. If your theory about this sentence was right, it would render void and meaningless the terrible indictment of Jacob. Such rendition would destroy the force of the statement that it was for the purpose of raising a righteous seed unto him of the loins of Joseph. It would, by antithetical reasoning, declare that the seed he was then trying to raise up by monogamic law, was not his; and that he would have none until he commanded contrary to the strict law then obtaining. "For if I *will*," construed as you state it, would mean that he had not at that time willed to raise up a righteous seed to himself; but that when he would so *will*, he would do so by giving a law contrary to and conflicting with the commandment he then gave.

The statement that the polygamic practices of the Hebrew race were "not known among the Nephites" is too glaring to pass without notice. What means the language, "They seek to excuse themselves because of the things written of David and Solomon?" "They understand not the Scriptures?" "I will not suffer that this people shall do like unto them of old?"

The discovery that there are "two kinds of plural marriage," is unique, and worthy of the cause you advocate. David and Solomon practiced these two kinds, so you say. Please tell me when David began to practice the one and ceased to practice the other? Also please state at what period of Solomon's life was he practicing the one and abstaining from the other.

It is a very strange thing that while you admit the premises of the argument of my last letter, that Adam, Noah, Lehi are all examples of God's establishment of the monogamic principle; and that under the dispensations then inaugurated, plural marriage would have been a sin, that you can still say that it is no argument "against polygamy."

The same kind of argument would destroy the basis and fabric of every created thing. For instance: God created man as we now see him, one head, two eyes, one mouth, two ears, two arms, two legs, &c. But this is no argument with you that God did not intend that a man might not have two heads, four eyes, four legs, four arms, four ears, &c. Yet every departure from the established form is a monstrosity, a deformity, a *lapsus naturae*. The vine was created to bear grapes, the fig tree figs; but this is no argument that man may not gather "grapes of thorns and figs of thistles." God "set some in the Church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, after that pastors," &c; but that is no argument but what there may be in the church popes, cardinals, prelates, curates, sees, &c, if your logic be true.

I cling so tenaciously to the Word of God in the Book of Mormon, because in direct harmony with the law of marriage as defined by Jacob, is the law given to the church "in the fullness of times," as found in the Doctrine and Covenants. It is also in keeping with the dispensations of Adam, Noah, and Christ.

Here I present what may have escaped your memory, that in the coming forth of the Book of Mormon, the conferring of

the authority to preach the Gospel, and the establishing of the Church in these last days, the fact was presented that the Adamic dispensation was a gospel one. That the gospel was before the law. That the law was added because of transgression, and that the fruitful cause of God's displeasure towards the people and the giving of the law was the breaking of and departure from the everlasting covenant, the gospel. That Noah was a preacher of the gospel; and that the world was deluged to death because it rejected his gospel administration. That in Christ the law, which had been added as a school-master, was ended. That the dispensation of Christ was also a gospel dispensation. It so happens that you have admitted all this substantially. It follows then that in each of these gospel dispensations the monogamic rule prevailed by the design and introduction of God. You also admit that Lehi and Jacob's dispensation on this land was monogamic. It is also in proof that in the establishing the gospel economy through Joseph Smith in 1830, it was again instituted as monogamic. No surer evidence that in a gospel dispensation, monogamy was God's plan and will, ought to be asked by any mortal being.

One of the marks upon the revelation which you claim as the basis of plural marriage, which warrants my conclusion that it is not from God, is that it contradicts the rule obtaining in each and every gospel dispensation. It can not be from God, for it is not like him. It contradicts all former revelations from God upon the same subject. If the phrase, "I will command my people," was prophetic, it is far more reasonable, and more in harmony with God's characteristics as revealed by the revelations to the church, to believe that the command of 1831, which "was to be a law to them then and in the New Jerusalem," "was given in fulfillment of said prophecy, than to believe the labored construction you put upon it. For the command of 1831 is like the one given to Lehi; is like the gospel dispensations of the past; and in accordance with the examples set by God when he essayed to people the earth.

David Fulmer does not state that the revelation on celestial marriage was presented to the High Council at Nauvoo, August 12th, 1843, by my father's "knowledge and consent." The statement made in the affidavit, is that on the convening of the

High Council that day, Dunbar Wilson, who had heard some rumors about plural wifery, made inquiry about those rumors. Upon this inquiry Hyrum Smith went to his house, got a copy of the revelation and read it to the council, bearing testimony to its truth. Leonard Soby, Austin Cowles and William Marks, would not receive it, nor the testimony of Hyrum Smith. Father was not there. The revelation was not submitted by him nor with his "knowledge and consent." The presentation of it, so far as Mr. Fulmer's affidavit is concerned, was prematurely forced upon Hyrum Smith. It was not formally presented by call of the Seer in an official manner, *to test its validity*. Is this copy the one that was made by Joseph Kingsbury, kept by N. K. Whitney, until after his death it fell into Pres. B. Young's hands? Is it the copy made by William Clayton and kept by Pres. B. Young in his private desk, on which he had a patent lock? Is it the copy of which Emma Smith burned the original?—an original which she states she never saw? Mr. Littlefield, when you made this false statement respecting what Mr. Fulmer stated in his affidavit, did you forget that you had published a copy, and that I could read the English language?

Let me repeat, though you do not like it, there is no scriptural evidence that Abraham was a polygamist. Sarah was his wife until she died (Gen. 23: 2); Keturah after Sarah's death (Gen. 25: 1). Hagar was his concubine, not his wife (Gen. 21: 9-12).

Whatever God may have said to Sarai, as stated by Josephus, quoted by you, it was not by any prophet's hand, nor the hand of a king that Abram received Hagar. It was Sarai who took the Egyptian slave to his bed. But your witness proves too much for your case, for he also states that when Sarah decided that Hagar must go, Abraham agreed to it because "God was pleased with what Sarah had determined." Josephus, B. 1, c. 12. More than this, the sagacious servant of Abraham when making his statement to Laban, said of Isaac, "He is his (Abraham's) legitimate son; and is brought up as his *only* heir." Ibid c. 16. Josephus places the marriage of Abraham and Keturah after Sarah's death.

So far as Moses is concerned, it is clear that the daughter of Jethro, was an Ethiopian woman. This woman Moses mar-

ried before his return to Egypt; and there is no record of his having taken any other.

The allusion made in Numbers 12, is made in relating the history of the people while yet they were in the wilderness; and the sentence "the Ethiopian woman whom he had married," more reasonably applies to Zipporah, to whom Moses was a "bloody husband," because he had circumcised her children, than to a second or concubinal wife. Besides this, if he had married a second wife who was an Ethiopian woman, he would have had two of the same race. In that case Miriam's reproach would have been that he had married two Ethiopian women, not "the woman." Your readers will do well to read Numbers 12, and Exodus 2, without your befogged spectacles, Mr. Littlefield. The inference that Zipporah and the Ethiopian woman named in Numbers 12 are two separate women, and thus make two wives for Moses in order to fasten polygamy upon him, is not tenable.

Why should you state what is so easily disproved concerning Jacob's marriage. Rachel and not Leah was Jacob's real wife. Leah was palmed off upon Jacob by the designing Laban. "Did I not serve thee for Rachel," was Jacob's indignant remonstrance. Nor is it true that Leah was Jacob's wife in any sense for seven years before he obtained Rachel. The hard necessities of your cause make you to stumble in your statements. Jacob, recognizing the fact that Laban had deceived him, and had the power to enforce the advantage gained over him, and fearful that he might lose Rachel, submitted to "fulfill" Leah's week;" at the end of which "week" he was married to Rachel, for whom he continued to serve the seven years enforced by Laban. In the eyes of God, and good men, Rachel was Jacob's real wife, and the accepting of Joseph and Benjamin, in whom the succession is named is proof, not that God sanctioned polygamy, but that he had respect to the marital betrothal of these two, Jacob and Rachel.

The first wife given to David was Michal, and she was the gift of Saul. Saul in David's enforced absence married her to Phaltiel. Was she David's wife? After Nabal's death David took Abigail, and Ahinoan after Samuel's death.

Let me call your attention to what I presume has escaped you.

The relation of David's taking the wife of Uriah to be his wife, as you admit, and as it is stated in the so-called revelation on plural wives, was a grievous wrong and not in harmony with the theory of plural marriage, but in contravention of those laws which you hold to in regard to marriage. She is not reckoned as his wife legitimately by you, neither by the monogamic nor the one called by you the righteous polygamic law. David's successor was not the son of any one of his polygamic wives you count them; but was the fruit of his loins by Bathsheba, the wife of Uriah. It was her son Solomon who succeeded to King David. If then polygamy is approved of God because David had more than one wife; then by a parity of reasoning, the connection between David and Solomon's mother is approved, and the means by which she became his polygamic wife is sanctioned of God. This son is the one selected for the exhibition of favor. David murdered Uriah that he might obtain his wife. Nathan, the one whom you say gave Saul's wives to David, declared that David was a sinner in the matter. Your revelation also brands the transaction as a sin; and yet the issue of that marriage is approved and that bloody deed condoned by the favor and blessing of God. No amount of twisting can avoid this conclusion being forced upon you, if you insist upon my acceptance of your argument.

I am no more convinced now that Joseph Smith, the Martyr, practiced "plural marriage" or "polygamy," as it is called and practiced in Utah, than I was before you opened the correspondence in the *Journal*. You have produced no evidence of which I have not been aware of its existence. No new lines of support to your doctrine have been advanced by you. The same double faced statements and arguments that others have presented have been revamped by you. I give you in as concise form as practicable, reasons for not accepting the statements and proofs offered by you to prove that my father was a polygamist, and that the doctrine has not divine origin.

1. Joseph Smith was the human instrument through whom a dispensation of the gospel was committed to man.

2. Every gospel dispensation, Adam's, Noah's, Christ's, on the eastern continent, and Lehi's and Christ's on the western, was monogamic in its institution of marriage.

3. The dispensation committed through Joseph Smith was like each preceding gospel one, in its marriage institution, monogamic.

4. Polygamy, the having more than one wife at the same time, was specifically forbidden to the Church of Christ as established by command of God in 1830, by Joseph Smith and others. Book of Mormon, Jacob 2d chapter.

5. Monogamy, the having but one wife at the same time, was instituted in the Church of Christ established in 1830, by direct revelation from Jesus Christ the Great Spiritual and Divine Head of the Church. Doctrine and Covenants, sec. 13, (42), par. 7. Ibid, sec. 65, (49), par. 3. Ibid, sec. 109, (111). The latter reference is found in all the editions of the Book of Covenants published by the Church in Europe and America, except the one published in Utah in 1876, from which it is expunged and the so-called revelation on polygamy put in its place.

6. Monogamy was adopted, and polygamy declared to be a crime by the Church in 1835, in public assembly; and this action was endorsed by the publication of the article then adopted, in repeated editions of the Church articles and covenants from that year until, and including the Liverpool edition published in 1854.

7. No revelation from God authorizing the abrogation of the monogamic rule, and the substitution of a plural wife system, or polygamy, was received, presented to the church and adopted by it during the lifetime of Joseph Smith.

8. Joseph Smith denounced polygamy in February, 1844, *Times and Seasons*, vol. 3, p. 423.

9. The existence and teaching of the doctrine of plurality of wives in the church at Nauvoo in 1844, was publicly denied by Hyrum Smith, one of the First Presidency, on March 15th, 1844, *Times and Seasons*, vol. 5, p. 474.

10. The official organ of the church, the *Times and Seasons*, of April 1st, 1844, contains the following denunciation: "If any man writes to you, or preaches to you, doctrines contrary to the Bible, the Book of Mormon, or the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, set him down as an impostor. . . . You need not wait to write to us to know what to do with such men; you have the authority with you, —try them by the principles contained in the *acknowledged word* of God; if they preach, or teach, or prac-

tice contrary to that, disfellowship them; cut them off from among you as useless and dangerous branches."— *Times and Seasons*, vol. 5, p. 490. John Taylor, Editor.

11. Polygamy is not taught in any part of the acknowledged word of God.

12. Joseph Smith was a man in the full use of manhood's physical powers, capable of begetting children at the time of his death, and had children by his wife Emma, one of which was born to him after his death.

13. No children were born to Joseph Smith by any of those women whom you assert were wives to him with all that the name implies.

14. There are good reasons for believing that had Joseph Smith been married to those whom you assert were his plural wives, issue must have resulted; and the fact that no children were born to him in polygamy is strong proof that he had no such wives; especially as said women subsequently bore children to other men, no better physically than he.

In regard to the certificates in your last letter: At the time Lovina Walker made the statement respecting what Emma Smith told her, Mrs. Smith was living, and her testimony could have been obtained. Mrs. Smith stated that she neither gave any woman to her husband in marriage, nor knew of his having any wife but herself.

The affidavit of Emily D. P. Young is false upon its face; for at the time that she states that she was "married, or sealed to Joseph Smith, President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, by James Adams, a High Priest in said church; according to the laws of the same regulating marriage;" to-wit, May 11th, 1843, there was no law of said church permitting, or authorizing plural, polygamous, or bigamous marriages. This is proved by your own statement that the revelation bears date July 12th, 1843, two full months after said marriage, or sealing took place; and by such giving of the "revelation the law of plural marriage was given to the church." It did not exist before that; nor then, for it was not until August 12th, still a month later that the revelation was even read to a single quorum; and it was not then read by direction of Joseph Smith, but to still the inquiry of Dunbar Wilson, which inquiry was

caused by rumors which he placed no confidence in. Worse than this, that so-called revelation was *never presented to the church for endorsement, sanction and adoption, until August 29th, 1852.* The statements in this affidavit, if true, so far as the act of marriage, or *sealing* is concerned, state that Joseph Smith was a bigamist, having married an unmarried woman while yet his legal wife was living. This was a sin against his wife Emma. If he afterward cohabited with Emily D. P. Young, he sinned secretly against my mother. Now, who thus makes him a sinner, you who assert and believe this affidavit, or I who disbelieve and deny it?

If the affidavit is true, Joseph Smith transgressed two well accredited rules of the law of the church, at that time prevailing. One of these rules is that forbidding to have more than one wife living at the same time; the other that which declares that "he who keeps the laws of God hath no need to break the law of the land." If the statement that Joseph Smith was married to Emily D. P. Young in Nauvoo, Illinois, May 11th, 1843, is true, Joseph Smith, Emily D. P. Young and James Adams were all liable to prosecution for violating the statutes of said state defining the crime of bigamy and providing the penalties for such infraction of the law. Who then makes Joseph Smith a transgressor, you who believe and affirm such things, or I who disbelieve and deny them?

In the face of what is above written, how can you consistently expect a man whose legal training you admit gives him the power to analyze evidence and give it true weight, to receive as conclusive what is so unsatisfactory and damaging to your own cause.

As before, while I do not accept the proofs offered by you that my father was a pluralist, or polygamist, as conclusive, I repeat that whether he was, or was not, the gospel of Christ as it was taught by Christ and as recommitted through Joseph Smith, is complete and sufficient for the salvation of man. Nor is it essential to the validity of that gospel that my father be proved to be a polygamist, or that I be compelled to believe that he was.

JOSEPH SMITH.

LAMONI, Iowa, September 12th, 1883.